DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 967 RC 011 339

AUTHOR Fratoe, Frank A.
TITLE Education Training Programs and Rural Development.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.; Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.; National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE May 79
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Rural Education Seminar (College Park, Maryland, 29-31 May 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Education; *Educational Programs; Extension Education; *Government Role; *Human Development; *Job Training; Policy Formation; Program Improvement; Rural Areas; *Rural Development; Rural Extension; *Vocational Education; Vocational High Schools
IDENTIFIERS Comprehensive Employment and Training Act

ABSTRACT

The role of education in the human development of rural areas is considered by some to be the single most important thing that can be done to raise rural standards of living. Recognizing this need, the Federal government has sponsored three types of training programs relative to rural development; each is the responsibility of a different agency. Career and Vocational programs sponsored by the Office of Education use half a billion dollars annually on preparation of students for nearly all nonprofessional occupations. Employment training programs under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) include the Comprehensive Manpower Services, the Migrant Farmworker Program, the Native American Program, and the Job Corps. With a budget of 4.5 billion in 1976, these programs delivered such services as recruitment, counseling, training, placement assistance, and employment to those who could not find work. Extension programs deliver education in the categories of agriculture and natural resources, home economics, 4-H youth and community resource development. This paper reviews implementation of the three types of education training programs in rural settings and discusses problems encountered both in terms of internal operation and external conditions. The analysis concludes with alternative policy directions as reflected in the literature on rural education training. (DS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED172967

EDUCATION TRAINING PROGRAMS AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

by

Frank A. Fratoe

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Frank A. Fratoe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Economic Development Division
Economics, Statistics, and Cooperatives Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture

For presentation at the Rural Education
Conversations Seminar, College Park, Maryland
May 29-31, 1979

Paper presented at the Rural Education Seminar, College Park, Maryland, 29-31 May 1979. Seminar sponsored by the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Office of the Assistant Secretary of Education, Office of Education's Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, and the National Institute of Education's Program on Educational Policy and Organization) and the U. S. Department of Agriculture (Science and Education Administration).

RC 011339

This paper concerns the role of education training programs in fostering rural development. Emphasis will be on the Federal commitment to rural education training and associated issues. Several major Federally sponsored programs will be explored, although it is recognized that local/State governments and private organizations also make important initiatives in development-related training. Unfortunately, analyses of the latter programs along with additional Federal efforts must be deferred because space limitations preclude them. After a brief conceptual examination of rural development, the paper will proceed to review career/vocational education, employment training, and Extension/land-grant university programs, as well as the major efforts at coordinating these services for rural participants. The final section will summarize some tentative policy directions gleaned from the literature.

Rural Development

There are many definitions for the term "rural development." It has been variously described as: (1) improvements or gains for rural persons, communities, or other units on variables such as income or education; (2) movement toward some projected future state defined to be desirable, such as self-sustained economic growth; (3) increased capacity to use resources; (4) a higher level of differentiation in roles and functions for individuals and other social units; (5) increasing work and nonwork options open to individuals; (6) sustained production of a surplus of products and/or skills; (7) satisfying basic human physiological and psychological needs; (8) improving the quality of life. (12, 31) 1/

Forming a single definition of rural development from the above list may not be possible, but it is clear that economic and human development are key

---

1/ Underscored numbers in parentheses refer to literature listed in the references section.

parts of the concept. (55) The goal of economic growth in smaller communities away from cities is to produce more jobs for rural Americans which should increase their income and buying power, as well as furnish greater tax resources for community service improvements. The goal of human development is a complementary one, i.e, to supply the trained labor force and competent leadership necessary for economic growth to proceed. These two aspects of rural development are mutually dependent since each is unlikely to occur without the other. Providing rural people with more opportunities in education training will not benefit their communities if the local labor market under-utilizes higher skill levels; the better educated will simply migrate to seek urban employment. On the other hand, inadequate human resources can retard development of lagging regions even when job expansion is attempted through financial incucements (16); an unskilled rural population cannot perform the tasks demanded by modern technological industry.

The Federal Government has recognized the need to support these two aspects of rural developent. Community, agricultural, natural resource, and human development programs have been implemented in rural areas through varied cooperative arrangements with other governmental or nongovernmental agencies. While it is not possible to determine precisely the effects of such programs, there is little doubt they have contributed to improved social and economic conditions in parts of rural America. The outmigration flow of population in many areas has now been reversed and a new rural economic vitality seems to be present. More employment opportunities exist for rural residents because companies have been decentralizing their operations from cities. For example, between 1970 and 1977 the rate of nonmetro nonfarm employment increase was twice as high as the corresponding metro rate. (7) Gains have also been made concerning other measures of well being such as income and housing quality.

However, despite recent advances rural areas continue to lag behind their urban counterparts on several socioeconomic criteria, particularly those associated with human development. Rural regions still contain a large disproportionate share of the poor and provide relatively fewer educational and health services. (7) In terms of formal education, rural residents experience a clearly disadvantaged status as they are more likely to enroll in school later, complete fewer school years, score lower on national tests, fail to attend college, and not enroll in vocational training courses. (11) With their obvious human development needs, including education training, rural areas might be expected to receive a substantial share of Federal resource assistance, but this is not the case. Per capita levels of human resource funding by the Federal Government are actually lower in nonmetro counties than elsewhere. (38) 2/

Federal agencies nonetheless play an important role in promoting rural human development. Most notably, education training programs under Federal auspices help rural youth to prepare for occupations and older adults to upgrade their work skills for job advancement or alternative careers. Education training may be extremely useful for agricultural laborers and farmers by enabling them to apply new skills in earning higher incomes both on or off the farm. (22, 51) Business and political leaders have learned constructive techniques fostering local development efforts. The rural poor, who need education training services perhaps most acutely, receive valuable assistance. So important is this effort in the overall development process that, as one research team puts it, "improvement of the education...training of rural

---

2/ In Fiscal Year 1976, per capita Federal outlays for human resource development were $786 for metro counties and $742 for nonmetro counties. (38)

persons is the single most important thing that can be done to raise rural standards of living." (20, p. 60).

Relevant literature on the present subject describes three major types of Federally sponsored education training programs related to rural development, each the responsibility of a different agency. These types will be discussed in the following sections.

Career/Vocational Education Programs

The term "career education" refers to experiences through which students learn about work, comprising awareness of work values, counseling, exploration of alternative occupations, work-study programs, job placement services, and vocational education. "Vocational education," which has a longer history of usage, is narrower in meaning as it designates only preparation for a primary work role, usually one not demanding extensive higher education as would be the case for professional occupations. (18) However, the two terms are often used interchangeably in the literature and together concern the more work-oriented facets of school instruction. For those reasons, the single expression "career/vocational education" will be employed here.

Critics have sometimes argued that career/vocational education offers students little economic payoff because their training is inadequate for specific business and industrial requirements or because labor markets cannot use the vocational skills learned in the classroom. Proponents counter with some data showing an employment and earnings advantage for career/vocational education graduates at least during the first decade beyond high school. (22, 39) If true, this would be a positive outcome for many rural young people who generally enter the permanent labor force early. Career/vocational education might also be a useful means for improving the "fit" between schooling and occupational selection; accumulated evidence implies that rural high school

seniors have career aspirations which are incongruent with their early adult behaviors as well as inconsistent with job market realities. (19, 41)

Federal Commitment. The Federal Government spends well over half a billion dollars annually on career/vocational education programs supervised by HEW's Office of Education. The first Federal support for these programs was authorized under the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 which pertained to a limited number of occupations: agricultural training, homemaking, trade and industrial education, teacher training, and distributive education. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 and subsequent amendments have widened the scope of Federal aid to include employment preparation in nearly all nonprofessional occupations. (53) The Education Amendments of 1974 authorized a modest number of demonstration projects designed to result in exemplary career education models.

Most Federal career/vocational education funds are channeled through State governments in a block-grant fashion for allocation among occupational program categories which best serve individual State needs. Federal legislation does require set-asides for special target groups such as the handicapped, educationally and economically disadvantaged persons, etc. (46) The assumption is that sufficient data exist to accurately identify target groups in all parts of the country. That assumption may not be applicable to rural areas, however. If rural populations are less likely to register for some form of Federal or State assistance program (the basis for labeling persons handicapped or disadvantaged) counts are likely to be understated. (40) The latter possibility may help explain why rural areas do not obtain a larger share of Federal career/vocational education aid. Nonmetro counties, in Fiscal Year 1976, received only an estimated 18 percent of funds involved in 8 smaller Federally

supported vocational and career education programs. (38) 3/ Comparable data concerning the two largest programs, Basic Grants to States and the Consumer and Homemaking Program, are not available for FY 1976; but in FY 1972 just 13 percent of total funds for these two programs went to nonmetro areas. (50) Nonmetro America contains about one-third of the nation's population.

Rural Problems. There are several long-standing problems associated with delivering career/vocational services to rural students. For example, students in small rural schools have not had the full access to career/vocational training available to their urban counterparts. An attempt has been made to overcome this difficulty by creating area vocational high schools (as provided under the Vocational Education Act) which have done much to prepare rural residents for employment. (28) Students from smaller schools commute full- or part-time to a regional center where they find training opportunities not present in their home communities. However, because regional centers may officially encompass a large geographic area while actually serving a small population clustered nearby, the most geographically isolated rural students still have little real access. (45) Some observers believe access-related issues are financial in origin. Large capital expenditures make career/vocational education universally expensive but, as Sher puts it, "in rural areas, the general problems of low enrollment and low per-pupil wealth combine to make urban-style comprehensive vocational education programs financially inaccessible." (45, p. 11)

Even where financial resources are sufficient, rural schools have the tendency to focus a disproportionate share on traditional career subjects,

3/ The 8 programs are: Innovation, Curriculum Development, Personnel Development Awards, Personnel Development for States, Appalachian Vocational Education, Bilingual Vocational Education, Cooperative Education, and Career Education. (38) The allocations cited are based on Federal outlays data which may not be completely accurate because of estimation procedures and other factors.

i.e., agriculture and homemaking. These limited course offerings, though important for farm living, do little to ready students for nonfarm jobs. (15, 28) A wider range of career/vocational programs may be advisable to help train people for new positions in an expanding rural labor market, foster the work skills desired by business firms who wish to relocate, and create human development initiatives for local economic growth. A general lack of guidance counseling prevents many rural youths from obtaining full knowledge of the local or regional employment situation. (11, 15) They are less exposed to a great variety of actual occupations than are city youth, thus must rely more heavily on guidance information. Similarly, the network of private career/vocational education efforts and youth employment programs which exists in every metropolitan area is seldom present in rural communities. Absence of a support network means greater training burdens on schools ill-equipped to handle them. (45)

Examples of Programs. The following rural career/vocational education programs, whose descriptions were selected randomly from the literature, should give some idea of their potential for human resource development.

The Cashmere, Washington, school district assisted 15 other districts in giving career education workshops where teachers were trained to design at least one career education learning experience per class. Cashmere has also established career preparation activities for all elementary and secondary pupils; evaluations reveal that students are gaining academic knowledge and skills through the project. (23) Officials in the Meeker, Colorado, school system believed their students were not being exposed to the full range of jobs each should know about, so a "vocational exploration" program was initiated. Informal, but quite successful, it has allowed pupils to earn scholastic credit for training at a local hospital, with a Forest Service veterinarian, or with any of 70 local small businesses and state agencies. (52) The New York State

Bureau of Migrant Education furnishes services to the children of migrant farmworkers through a network of 13 centers, each serving an "outreach" function for dropouts and in-school adolescents in the areas of career counseling and on-the-job training. (29)

Illustrations can be drawn of other career/vocational programs more directly related to rural economic development. The regional vocational center in Staples, Minnesota, helped revitalize a farm area suffering from water shortage by developing adult education courses to train irrigation technicians and well drillers. Expanded production from irrigated farmland required more machinery with the technicians to operate and repair it; larger marketing facilities were also needed. At each step, new vocational education programs met the enlarged training objectives. (1) Maryland's Division of Vocational-Technical Education is currently cooperating with a coal company to train workers at a rural community college near a new deep mine. Over 400 student workers are learning the new technology of deep mining, and it is estimated that every mining job will generate two other local jobs in professional and retail services. (1)

Employment Training Programs

There is widespread agreement that employment (or manpower) programs to match disadvantaged workers with present or future jobs can make a major contribution to rural human and economic development. These programs have a number of similar elements: (1) training, whether on-the-job (OJT), in the classroom, or some combination of both to improve job skills; (2) pre-employment support activities, including counseling, recruitment, etc. which help workers prepare for training or employment; (3) labor market information systems to provide workers with a knowledge of job opportunities and employers with information about workers; (4) public employment programs for people who cannot

find private work. Obviously, employment programs alone cannot achieve rural development, but when linked with other measures they may be quite helpful in promoting economic growth. (28, 51)

The Federal Government has shared in the training aspect of employment programs since passage of the Manpower Development Training Act (MDTA) in 1962. Programs authorized by MDTA and subsequent legislation were consolidated under the 1973 Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). Currently, four CETA programs have major training components. The largest is Comprehensive Manpower Services (CETA, Title II) 4/ which furnishes both classroom skill training and OJT for labor market entry. The Migrant Farmworker Program and the Native American Program (CETA, Title III) stress classroom instruction not only to upgrade job skills but to teach basic academics where needed for two primarily rural groups. The Job Corps (CETA, Title IV), whose objective is to improve employability of the most economically disadvantaged youth, offers an extensive educational program ranging from communication and computation skills to work orientation; Job Corps high school dropouts can study for the GED test to obtain a diploma. (34, 35, 36, 53) While there is some debate over the effectiveness of the programs, evidence does show that employment training enhances skill performance resulting in increased employment rates and earnings. (6, 17)

Federal Commitment. The four programs are administered by the Labor Department's Employment and Training Administration through contracts with "prime sponsors," chiefly local government units with at least 100,000 population.

4/ This refers to the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act as amended in 1978. Title II now includes the comprehensive work and training activities contained previously in Title I. Allocations referred to in this paper concern programs authorized under the 1973 CETA legislation.

When an area within a state does not meet the population criterion and does not join a prime sponsor already eligible, the Governor becomes prime sponsor. The Governor may control a partly rural "balance of State" employment program from his/her office or may decentralize responsibility to rural sub-units of State government such as county commissioners or multicounty consortiums. (21) In Fiscal Year 1976, the Federal Government channeled about $4.5 billion through the decentralized CETA network to operate the four programs described above. It is impossible to determine accurately from existing data the urban-rural funding breakdown, either for total outlays or training funds only, but some sources indicate that rural areas have received less than their proportional share. (22, 38) 5/

CETA funding, targeted on disadvantaged groups who are assumed to need training the most, is somewhat more complex than vocational education distributions. The key factors considered are relative number of unemployed persons, relative number of persons in families earning income below the poverty level, and relative number of unemployed individuals living where substantial unemployment exists. (46) Unfortunately, data concerning unemployment and poverty do not always reflect actual rural needs. The unemployment rate, for example, does not count people who have part-time jobs but are willing to work full-time or those not working because of the comparatively few jobs available, factors which may be more prevalent in the nonurban sector. Some observers have argued that subemployment ratios, which measure those things, are generally higher for the rural population. (22, 51) Thus, an allocation formula based on data which do not reflect actual needs may prevent rural areas from receiving a larger share of CETA employment training support. Another reason could be that rural

---

5/ The four programs served an estimated 650,000 persons in FY 1976. (6, 35) It is not known how many of these were rural residents.

prime sponsors lack the proposal writing expertise possessed by their urban counterparts whose larger professional staffs are better able to prepare successfully funded comprehensive plans. (21) Perhaps the employment needs of cities have received higher Federal priority because they are simply more conspicuous. (22)

Rural Problems. Serious underfunding of rural employment training programs is a possibility requiring no further elaboration here. However, it may lead to other difficulties with negative results for human development. Studies have disclosed a lack of knowledge by rural residents about both the existence of local training programs and the procedures necessary to gain admission to them. Apparently, even when rural employment training operations are established they are not effective in reaching potential clients, particularly the low-income, underemployed persons who most need services. (13) Better funded and more extensive urban programs seem to have greater success in generating public attention. Poor access to rural employment training facilities is another consequence, although this may be due partly to the low-density population distribution found in rural areas. When programs are conducted miles away, prospective users cannot afford travel costs to reach the training site. They can be served only if their travel expenses are paid or mobile facilities are brought to them -- both expensive methods which may be beyond rural prime sponsor budgets.

Two other obstacles to effective rural employment training have been identified by Marshall. One is program inflexibility which claims "discourages innovation, causes the unique needs of rural people to be ignored, and sometimes leads to awkward tries at fitting urban models to rural situations." (27, p.19) Inflexibility also means local community leadership is not utilized enough in altering programs to fit local realities and the problem of rural minorities receives too little attention. The last, and probably foremost, obstacle is

poor coordination of employment training with similar programs. Despite certain efforts, e.g., linkages established between the Job Corps and community colleges whereby the latter provide technical training to selected enrollees, much remains to be done in achieving heightened coordination. (27, 36) A later section will analyze this issue.

Examples of Programs. Because coordination of training programs is a subject meriting special concern, it might be instructive to examine a few cases where coordination has been productively attained. Mention was made earlier of vocational education activities undertaken by the Staples, Minnesota area technical center. The center has also cooperated with the Rural Minnesota Concentrated Employment Program, a CETA prime sponsor, in designing programs to upgrade low-income farmers by teaching them how to irrigate their land. After receiving classroom instruction, they operate their own irrigation systems at home where instructors visit to give onsite assistance. (10, 47)

Several innovative work programs in the forests of rural Maine furnished new income sources and on-the-job training using CETA balance-of-State funding. There, CETA participants obtained intensive training in wood harvesting at the Washington County Vocational Technical Institute and gained practical experience in logging at a National Wildlife Refuge. Besides learning to identify trees and harvest them safely, trainees learned wood-use technololgy, i.e., the least wasteful uses for each tree harvested. Eighty percent of the participants completing the program landed jobs with Maine forest products industries. (58)

An example of future coordination can be noted in a recently funded program. More than 100 migrant and seasonally unemployed farm laborers in Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi will receive two years of training in allied health occupations under a grant to the Southern Vocational College (Tuskegee, Alabama).

Supported through CETA Title II, the program's objective will be to secure gainful employment for trainees in the health-care industry as an alternative to agricultural labor. Participants will be instructed in occupational fields like science technology, licensed practical nursing, medical records technology, dietary technology, and dental assistance technology. (33)

Extension/Land Grant University Programs

The Extension system 6/ is a cooperative arrangement embracing Federal, State, and county agencies in the attempt to extend educational programs from land-grant universities to local communities. Originally, it placed emphasis on teaching farm people useful skills in agriculture and home economics but now offers more subjects to a wider constituency. Programs are conducted locally by county Extension agents who receive administrative and research support from the State land-grant university. At the Federal level, the Extension office (formerly Extension Service) of the Department of Agriculture's Science and Education Administration communicates various research results to the States and helps develop procedures for training Extension personnel. Funding is dispersed from the three governmental levels as well as private sources. Extension programs can be classified under four broad categories: agriculture and natural resources, home economics, 4-H youth, and community resource development. Within each category, of course, there are more specific program components. (8, 9, 42)

Historically, all Extension services have made some contribution to rural human and economic development, whether in improving farmers' productivity or training rural youth. But community development seems to have the greatest relevance because it assists rural people in building maximum individual

---

6/ This has been formally designated as the United States Cooperative Extension Service.

and group resources. Extension programs can enable local leaders to identify comprehensive rural development objectives, better understand possible solutions, and formulate action plans to implement their decisions. (30) Furthermore, Extension helps communities with manpower development aimed at elevating employment abilities. (32) Through the Extension system, small communities draw upon the expertise of the land-grant university and USDA to examine alternatives in the solution of their development problems. This technical assistance becomes critical where day-to-day professional staff support is absent. The information dissemination function of Extension alone is a valuable asset because smaller communities may be uninformed about available Federal and State aid or lack enough knowledge to initiate appropriate actions. (8)

Federal Commitment. Although Extension was first authorized under the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, not until the mid-1950's did Congress earmark Extension funds specifically for community resource development work. (8) In Fiscal Year 1976, approximately 26 percent of staff years spent on community development was devoted to leadership and manpower (employment) training, while 36 percent of projects assisted fell in the latter two categories. (56) There are no readily obtainable data concerning the amount of Federal funds allocated solely for community development. However, it is known that Extension total funding in FY 1976 slightly surpassed 200 million dollars. An estimated 50 percent of the total funds went to metropolitan counties (38), a surprisingly high figure when the original rural-oriented nature of the program is considered. Despite this fact, Extension did provide workshops for more than 30,000 rural leaders in 1976 where they learned decisionmaking processes, citizen participation in governing activities, conflict management, social change, and other useful leadership skills. Thousands of rural labor force members were instructed through employment development programs, subsuming youth career awareness and classes for displaced agricultural workers. (56)

To augment the above efforts, Title V of the Rural Development Act of 1972 directed the nation's land-grant universities to help rural people attain development objectives. Title V, administered in close collaboration with USDA's Cooperative Research office as a joint research-Extension venture, has made possible additional human resource development projects in leadership training, employment skills training, and general education. (8, 24) During the 3-year pilot stage of this endeavor (FY 1974-76), almost 1,000 projects were carried out nationwide--13 percent related to education training. The entire program received $9 million over the 3-year period, only one-fifth of the $45 million first authorized. (24)

Rural Problems. Extension/land-grant university human development programs have some problems that resemble those associated with career/vocational education and employment training, as well as a few unique concerns. One of the former pertains to the few linkages currently existing between Extension and other agencies with training responsibilities. Working arrangements facilitating communication and coordination with such units are not common 7/ which may produce less efficient resource use. More external cooperative activities could prevent program duplication while strengthening Extension's complementary educational role. Similarly, fragmented employment training components of diverse Extension programs might be pulled together by internally coordinating efforts. (49) Underfunding of Title V caused several States to reduce their research and Extension programs for it; they indicated unwillingness to continue operating Title V projects when allocations were at low levels. (24)

Better citizen participation in decision making is a key factor because citizen input in the planning process will help assure that programs actually

7/ Some examples of cooperation between Extension and other agencies are given in the next section.

respond to client needs. Residents of some communities, though, cannot participate effectively because the planning structure does not provide for broad representation or because they lack information. (48) Perhaps for the same reasons there has been inadequate participation by minority groups such as minority youth, women, migrant and seasonal workers, limited resource farmers, and so on. They comprise the audiences having the greatest development needs for whom leadership and employment training assistance is critically important. (49) In-service training may be insufficient to familiarize all Extension personnel with prevailing employment-education trends and sensitize staff to the requirements of special populations. Moreover, a staff possessing increased expertise in these areas probably would be more qualified to relate Extension programming to other agencies with training responsibilities. (49)

Examples of Programs. As noted earlier, human development programs operating under the auspices of Extension/land-grant universities encompass both leadership and employment training elements. A few examples will indicate the scope of these two activities.

In one Maryland community, 28 local volunteer leaders enriched their skills in program planning and problem solving through Extension education. With better skills, they then led several organizations to start citizen education programs; they also created new information systems for a nonprofit development corporation and improved a credit union. (32) 200 rural participants in a Michigan leader development project conducted with Extension assistance studied functions of Federal, State, and local governments in the United States and Europe. (56) A county Extension agent in eastern Georgia served as coordinator for a "local government in action week" during which elected officials taught government-related subjects in the high schools and students visited county offices. (60) In Stephenson County, Illinois, Extension agents

and University of Illinois faculty teamed to explore difficult problems faced by local small businesses; area businessmen who attended seminars on the problems reported learning procedures they had not considered before. (43)

Both rural youth and adults have special employment training needs that have been addressed through Extension/land-grant university services. The 4-H youth staff of three northeastern Illinois counties established a 3-day "career camp" for 20 rural young people where they were acquainted with a wide range of career opportunities to supplement their own limited work experiences. The staff also collected resources for the trainees to use in presenting career information to their peers back home. (44) A Title V funded project in Clinton County, New York, was designed to bring adult education in basic skills and counseling services to local residents. The project, called HELLO (Higher Education Living Learning Opportunity), successfully helped rural adults develop the necessary abilities to obtain a job. (59)

Coordination of Education Training Programs

One important theme running throughout the previous discussion is the relative lack of coordination of education training programs. Each program type seems to have been conceived and implemented with little regard for its potential complementary role with other program types. Some attempts have been made to achieve coordination, e.g., teaching CETA participants at vocational education facilities (as described earlier). Also, Extension has taken an active part on many advisory councils in planning employment training, and Extension personnel have helped develop new vocational education programs locally. (49, 56) But these ventures have seldom been part of a large-scale, nationally coordinated effort to attain better program efficiency and responsiveness to comprehensive training needs. Research discloses only a few such cooperative efforts, three of which feature education training assistance for rural Americans.

Operation Hitchhike. This program has tried to bring employment services to rural people by "hitchhiking" the services onto already functioning institutions. Although county Extension offices by no means have been the only agencies tapped for their delivery capability, most often the cooperating unit has been Extension. (3) Under Operation Hitchhike, individual arrangements are made operative upon approval of a contract between the Labor Department and a State employment service; in turn, the latter contracts with the delivery agency to render assorted employment services, including education training, for rural areas where they are missing. (53) Extension employment agents have offered different kinds of training serving varied Hitchhike clientele. They have used local media to bring manpower information to the public's attention, supplied schools with resources to apply in career/vocational education planning and counseling, given workshops on managerial skill capacity building, arranged basic education classes for employees or supervisors, and worked directly with students. (3) They have even helped survey future labor market demands with the idea of shaping training programs to meet the projected needs. (32) Tweeten and Brinkman believe Hitchhike programs may achieve operation economies while promoting rural human resource development because "employment services [are] provided at less cost and with less expertise than full-service centers." (55, p. 109)

Concerted Services in Training and Education. An interdepartmental approach called Concerted Services in Training and Education (CSTE) was designed specifically to help rural people. Its objective was to show that education training, integrated with economic development activities, could contribute to increased employment opportunities. A task force representing HEW, Labor, Agriculture, and other Federal agencies organized the program. The CSTE approach calls for placing a coordinator into a rural county or counties to

work with community groups and government staff who administer various education training services. The coordinator, usually a respected local resident, identifies manpower requirements and brings together available training resources to meet them. Thus, the emphasis is placed on inducing existing structures to develop programs rather than to create a new organization. (51, 53)

Evaluation of CSTE pilot projects has been generally positive, e.g., more training opportunities are made available in CSTE areas and fuller utilization of public employment services is found. (14) In Marshall's opinion, CSTE appears to have the basic components of an effective rural development effort: "In the first place, it concentrates on drawing together available resources in a community and therefore avoids the need for large additional public expenditures. Second, it relies on a local coordinator...to be the catalyst for development and therefore avoids rivalry among the participating agencies... A third aspect, which gives the program considerable promise as a development procedure is its heavy reliance on community involvement. To have any significant impact, a rural development program probably requires heavy reliance on harnessing community energy to identify goals, collect information, and otherwise support development programs." (28, p. 107) 8/

Work-Education Councils. A newer Federal venture pertaining to education training is the Work-Education Council Demonstration Project. Its chief focus is to learn more about how collaborative actions can assist young people in the transition from school to work. 33 work-education councils have been established, 8 of which are either located in rural areas or service them. 9/ The rural councils are locally initiated community-based groups involving

---

8/ Both CSTE and Operation Hitchhike are no longer operative at the national level.

9/ Sites for these 8 councils are Bethel, Maine; East Peoria, Illinois; Alma, Michigan; Williamston, North Carolina; St. Albans, Vermont; Sioux Falls, South Dakota; Tullahoma, Tennessee; and Lincoln, Nebraska. (5)

educators, business people, Extension agents, agriculturists, union members, service agency representatives, parents, students, and others trying innovative methods to relate education and work. The Department of Labor, operating in consultation with HEW and Commerce, funds the project. (4, 5)

Each rural work-education council has initiated cooperative arrangements to handle the school-to-work transition issue but using different approaches. Education training programs often play a prominent role. For instance, one rural council has been involved in developing and coordinating employability skills' workshops for the county school district. Another, under contract with the local CETA prime sponsor, has established a unit to serve community employers by providing needed training for their employees; new delivery systems are being planning through coordinating the programs of local institutions. Several rural work-education councils sponsor "career information days" where students are brought together with community resource persons to learn about particular careers available and the specific skills appropriate for each. (5)

Work-education councils show promise as a vehicle for coordinating education training programs, but full evaluation of their effectiveness awaits a National Institute of Education study now underway.

Some Policy Directions

This essay has been a descriptive review of several Federal education training programs that have a bearing on rural human and economic development. The study has revealed some problems found when programs are conducted in rural areas, both in terms of internal operation and external coordination. An analysis of the present subject would not be complete, however, without comment on policies to overcome the relevant problems. A survey of the literature divulges many alternative policy directions, the most typical of which are

summarized below for convenient examination. The list is not meant to be exhaustive, nor does it imply endorsement by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as recommended policy. Rather, its purpose is to furnish a starting point for debate and discussion among decision-makers who must formulate policy on this subject.

(1) Further research is necessary to identify and collect data on rural education training needs as well as review programs designed to meet the needs. (54) If such research confirms that rural areas are not receiving adequate services, then the following policy directions might be considered:

(2) Encourage the expansion of career/vocational education programs to fields beyond agriculture and home economics, so that more diversified offerings can help prepare rural students for full participation in all relevant labor markets. (51, 57)

(3) Adopt alternative strategies for delivering career/vocational training to rural residents through such means as the regional vocational center, the intermediate education agency, the community college, and mobile facilities--the latter primarily designed to serve migrant workers or people living in remote areas. (15, 54)

(4) Strengthen career/vocational education programs for adults, especially those who need basic skills training to obtain a job or those anticipating a career change, and coordinate such lifelong learning opportunities with changing economic development needs. (2, 37)

(5) Devise allocation formulas for employment training (CETA) funds based on subemployment rather than unemployment figures to give rural areas greater funding equity; if this is not feasible, have separate parts of legislation deal with the special training-related problems of rural areas. (22, 51)

(6) Coordinate employment training programs with economic development activities to prepare the rural disadvantaged for job opportunities and upgrade overall labor force skills which may attract new industry. (26, 54)

(7) Develop "outreach" programs in rural places to acquaint or remind low-income persons of available but perhaps underutilized training services; extend services to people who cannot reach them in their present locations. (13)

(8) Redirect development and implementation of Extension/land-grant university programs toward audiences with the most critical needs, e.g., minority youth and limited resource farmers. (49)

(9) Provide additional opportunities for Extension in-service staff instruction (at national, regional, and local levels) to expand knowledge of employment trends and corresponding training requirements. (49)

(10) Encourage maximum participation of local community residents in Extension human resource training programs. (48)

(11) Foster cooperation among career/vocational education, CETA, and Extension/land-grant university officials at all governmental levels to achieve program complementarity through multilateral planning and administration. (25)

(12) Evaluate innovations in rural career/vocational education, employment training, Extension, and coordination efforts; then disseminate information about exemplary programs to the public and appropriate officials. (51)

REFERENCES

(1) American Vocational Association Special Reporter, Feb. 1979.

(2) Appalachia, Vol. 11, Oct.-Nov., 1977, p. 40.

(3) Booth, James H. "Operation Hitchhike, Manpower Planning, and Economic Development," in Collette Moser (ed.), Manpower Planning for Jobs in Rural America. Center for Rural Manpower and Public Affairs, Michigan State Univ., 1972, pp. 166-172.

(4) Center for Education and Work. A Charter for Improved Rural Youth Transition. National Manpower Institute, 1978.

(5) _____. The Work-Education Consortium: An Inventory of Projects in Progress. National Manpower Institute, 1978.

(6) Congressional Budget Office. Public Employment and Training Assistance: Alternative Federal Approaches. Congress of the United States, 1977.

(7) Economic Development Division Staff. "Rural America in the Seventies," Rural Development Perspectives, Nov. 1978, pp. 6-11.

(8) Extension Service. Cooperative Extension Service Programs. U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1976.

(9) _____. Extension Service USDA: Functions, Objectives, and Responsibilities. U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1971.

(10) Fedo, Michael W. "The School That Saved a Town," American Education, Vol. 8, Nov. 1972, pp. 6-9.

(11) Fratoe, Frank A. Rural Education and Rural Labor Force in the Seventies. RDRR-5. Economics, Statistics, and Cooperatives Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1978.

(12) Green, Bernal L. and Glenn R. Hawkes. "Development as a Multistage Process," Growth and Change, Vol. 5, Oct. 1974, pp. 21-25.

(13) Green, Bernal L., et al. Deterrents to Training and Employment, as Perceived by Low-Income Household Heads in Western Arkansas. Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin No. 814, 1976.

(14) Griessman, B. Eugene. Planned Change in Low-Income Rural Areas: An Evaluation of Concerted Services in Training and Education. Monograph No. 2, Center for Occupational Education, North Carolina State Univ., at Raleigh, 1969.

(15) Griessman, B. Eugene and Kenneth G. Densley. Review and Synthesis of Research on Vocational Education in Rural Areas. ERIC/CRESS, New Mexico State Univ., 1969.

(16) Hansen, Niles M. "Growth Centers, Human Resources, and Rural Development," in F. Ray Marshall (ed.) Human Resource Dimensions of Rural Development. Center for the Study of Human Resources, Univ. of Texas, 1977, Chapter 6.

(17) Hasian, J. T. "The New CETA Targets the Disadvantaged," Worklife, Vol. 3, Dec. 1978, pp. 3-6.

(18) Hoyt, Kenneth. Relationships Between Career Education and Vocational Education. Office of Education, Department of HEW, 1976.

(19) Jordan, Max, et al. Aspirations and Capabilities of Rural Youth in Relation to Present and Projected Labor Market Requirements. Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin No. 722, 1967.

(20) Leonardson, Gene S. and David M. Nelson. Rural Oriented Research and Development Projects: A Review and Synthesis. R&D Monograph 50, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1977.

(21) Levine, Louis. "Implications of CETA for Manpower Services in Rural Areas," in Collette Moser (ed.) CETA in Balance of State Areas. Center for Rural Manpower and Public Affairs, Michigan State Univ., 1974.

(22) Levitan, Sar A., et al. Human Resources and Labor Markets. Harper and Row, 1976.

(23) McKinley, Cindy. The Original American Early Morning Primer: A How-To-Do-It Guide for Implementing Career Education in Rural Schools. Career Education Project, Cashmere (Wash.) School District, n.d.

(24) Madden, J. Patrick. Rural Development and the Land Grant University. National Rural Center/Pennsylvania State Univ., 1977.

(25) Mangum, Garth L. Career Education and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. Office of Education, Department of HEW, 1978.

(26) Marshall, F. Ray (ed.) Human Resource Dimensions of Rural Development. Center for the Study of Human Resources, Univ. of Texas, 1977.

(27) _____. "Manpower Policies and Rural America," Manpower, Vol. 4, April 1972, pp. 15-19.

(28) _____. Rural Workers in Rural Labor Markets. Olympus Publishing Co., 1974.

(29) Mattera, Gloria. "Rural Education--Bigger Than You Think," Rural/Regional Education News, Vol. 30, May-June 1978, pp. 6-7.

(30) Mercure, Alex P. "Rural Development Activities of U.S. Department of Agriculture," in Rural Development Oversight. Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Rural Development, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, U.S. Senate, April 25, 1978, pp. 39-106.

(31) Moe, Edward O. and Lewis R. Tamblyn. Rural Schools as a Mechanism for Rural Development. ERIC/CRESS, New Mexico State Univ., 1974.

(32) Nelson, Donald L. Extension Community Development...Going...Growing... Extension Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1975.

(33) "News and Notes," Worklife, Vol 3., Nov. 1978, p. 9.

(34) Office of National Programs. Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Programs. Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1978.

(35) _____. National Employment and Training Programs. Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1977.

(36) Office of Youth Programs. "Education: A Primary Theme Crosscutting the Youth Initiatives," unpublished report, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1978.

(37) President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty. The People Left Behind. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

(38) Reid, J. Norman, et al. Federal Outlays in Fiscal 1976. RDRR-1. Economics, Statistics, and Cooperatives Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1978.

(39) Reubens, Beatrice G. "Vocational Education: Performance and Potential," Manpower, Vol. 6, July 1974, pp. 23-30.

(40) Rosenfeld, Stuart. "Vocational Education in Rural America," unpublished report, National Institute of Education, 1979.

(41) Ross, Peggy J. "Educational and Occupational Profiles for U.S. High School Seniors in the Class of 1972," unpublished report, Economics, Statistics, and Cooperatives Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1978.

(42) Sanders, Irwin T. Rural Society. Prentice-Hall, 1977.

(43) Scherer, Chris. "Solving Big Problems for Small Business," Extension Review, Vol 49, Mar.-Apr. 1978, pp. 14-15.

(44) Sherer, Chris and Lynnette Gearhart. "Who Are You and Where Are You Going? Can You Get There From Here?" Extension Review, Vol. 49, Sept.-Oct. 1978, pp. 8-9.

(45) Sher, Jonathan P. "Vocational Education in Rural America: Current Problems and Prospects," unpublished report, National Rural Center, 1978.

(46) Stevens, David W. "The Coordination of Vocational Education with CETA," Information Series No. 151, National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State Univ., 1978.

(47) Stevenson, Gloria. "CETA in the Land of Paul Bunyon," Worklife, Vol. 2, Sept. 1977, pp. 2-8.

(48) Subcommittee on Community Resource Development. Extension Education in Community Development. Extension Committee on Organization and Policy, 1976.

(49) _____. "Labor Programs in Extension," draft report, Extension Committee on Organization and Policy, 1978.

(50) Subcommittee on Rural Development. HEW Programs for Rural America. Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, 1975.

(51) Task Force on Southern Rural Development. Increasing the Options. Southern Regional Council, 1977.

(52) Thompson, Margery. "A Lot We Can Learn from Those Not-So-Second-Rate Rural Schools," American School Board Journal, Vol. 165, June 1978, pp. 36-39.

(53) Torpey, William G. Federal Personpower Involvement. Whittet and Shepperson, 1976.

(54) Tsutras, Frank G. "Congressional Rural Caucus Report on Issues, Problems, Recommendations for Action, and Conclusions As to What the Congress and the Administration Can, and Should, Do for Rural America," Congressional Rural Caucus, U.S. House of Representatives, 1978.

(55) Tweeten, Luther and George L. Brinkman. Micropolitan Development. Iowa State Univ. Press, 1976.

(56) U.S. Department of Agriculture. Rural Development: Information and Technical Assistance Delivered by the Department of Agriculture in Fiscal Year 1976. U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1976.

(57) U.S. Office of Education. Report of the Task Force on Rural Education. U.S. Office of Education, Department of HEW, 1969.

(58) Walker, Michael J. "CETA is a Natural in Maine," Worklife, Vol. 3, Mar. 1978, pp. 16-21.

(59) White, Donald J. "Clinton County Coordinates CRD," Extension Review, Vol. 49, Mar.-Apr. 1978, pp. 4-7.

(60) Williams, Robert L. "Local Officials Play Teacher for a Day," Extension Review, Vo. 49, Mar.-Apr. 1978, pp. 12-13.

EDUCATION:

-- Ph.D. & M.A. in Sociology, Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1974 & 1971

-- B.A. (Summa Cum Laude) in Philosophy, Ohio State Univ., 1969

PRESENT POSITION:

-- Sociologist/Rural Education Specialist; Economics, Statistics, and Cooperatives Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture

PAST POSITIONS:

-- Assistant Program Director and Assistant Professor of Sociology
Educational Opportunity Fund Program and Sociology Department
Rutgers University-Camden, 1976-77

-- Research Associate and Instructor
Educational Opportunity Fund Program and Sociology Department
Rutgers University-Camden, 1975-76

-- Project Evaluator
Educational Consortium in Instruction
Rutgers University-Camden, 1974-75

-- Research Assistant and Instructor
Sociology Department
University of Pennsylvania, 1969-74

PUBLICATIONS:

-- "Education Training Programs and Rural Development," presented at Rural Education Conversations Seminar, 1979.

-- The Educational Level of Farm Residents and Workers, Rural Development Research Report No. 8, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1979.

-- Rural Education and Rural Labor Force in the Seventies, Rural Development Research Report No. 5, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1978.

-- "A Status Survey of 'Special' College Faculty," College and University, Vol. 52, Fall 1976, pp. 79-92.

-- A Description and Evaluation of the Educational Consortium in Instruction, Rutgers University, 1975. (ED 125425)

-- "Due Process and the Student-Institution Relationship in American Higher Education," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1974.

MEMBERSHIPS:

-- Phi Beta Kappa
-- Rural/Regional Education Association
-- American Sociological Association